

ATTACHMENT R
BUREAU OF MOTOR VEHICLES

EVALUATION of
RFP # 5-17



FOR THE
DIGITAL DRIVERS' LICENSE (DDL) SYSTEM

Response Evaluation Plan Overview

The state has selected a group of qualified professionals to act as an evaluation team. The entire team will be responsible for the evaluation of each vendor's proposal. This involves the completion of all of the Response Evaluation Forms against the criteria described in this document. Some members of the evaluation team will only need to limit themselves to the specific areas of the evaluation as their evaluation will be limited to the specific technical area(s) for which these individuals are experts.

RESPONSE EVALUATION PROCEDURE

There will be six categories of evaluation criteria:

Form of Proposal
Minority Participation goal
Price Proposal
Overall Management Judgment
Quality of Proposed Approach
Quality of Response to Requirements

Each of the six categories of the evaluation criteria is described more fully in the next sections of this chapter.

The procedures for evaluating the responses against the evaluation criteria will be as follows:

- Each proposal will be evaluated for form on a pass/fail basis. Proposals which are incomplete or otherwise do not conform to proposal submission requirements may be considered non-responsive and the State may elect to eliminate the response from further consideration or evaluation.
- The offeror must show that there is minority business enterprises participation (by racial minority-owned companies) in the proposed contract in their plan as stated in Section 1.21, 1.22, and Attachment A of this RFP. This plan will be evaluated according to section 4.2.6 of the RFP.
- Each proposal will be evaluated on the basis of overall management judgment requirements as stated in Section 3 of the RFP. In addition, proposals which do not conform to the mandatory RFP requirements as stated in Section 3 may be eliminated from further consideration. Where appropriate, a point score will be established for each response in this category.
- Each proposal will be evaluated on the basis of the quality of proposed approach to requirements as stated in Section 3 of the RFP. In addition, proposals which do not conform to mandatory RFP requirements as stated in Section 3 may be eliminated

from further consideration. Where appropriate, a point score will be established for each response in this category.

- Each proposal will be evaluated on the basis of the quality of response to requirements as stated in Section 3 of the RFP. In addition, proposals which do not conform to the mandatory RFP requirements as stated in Section 3 may be eliminated from further consideration. Where appropriate, a point score will be established for each response in this category.
- The Department of Administration may allow vendors to correct errors of a non-material nature in their proposal, if the correction of the error(s) is not prejudicial to the State or judged by the Department of Administration to affect the competitive nature of the procurement. All such determinations will be made by the Department of Administration with the assistance of the BMV. Vendor corrections of this nature shall be made within the time frame allowed by that Department, or the vendor's proposal will be judged non-responsive to the requirement of the RFP.
- Based upon the results of this evaluation, the proposal determined to be the most advantageous to the State, taking into account all of the evaluation factors, may be selected by the State for further action.
- If, however, no response is sufficiently advantageous to the State, the State may take whatever further action deemed appropriate. If for any reason a response is selected and it is not possible to consummate a contract with the vendor, the State may begin contract preparation with the next highest ranked vendor or determine that no such alternative vendors exists.

Evaluation Criteria Categories

The evaluation criteria categories are described below, together with a brief explanation of the basis for evaluation of that category. The percentage of the total point score associated with each category is recorded in section 4.2 of the RFP.

- **Form of Proposal (Pass/Fail)**

In evaluating the form of proposal, each proposal will be reviewed to determine compliance with the proposal preparation requirements outlined in the RFP.

- **Price Proposal**

This category will be rated based upon the vendor provided pricing information in addition to that required by the RFP. Creative pricing structures and disclosure of supporting pricing detail are included in this category.

- **Overall Management Judgment**

This category will be rated based upon a combination of factors. These factors include, but are not limited to:

Past vendor performance, preferably on projects of comparable complexity and size and an assessment of expected performance of the vendor for this engagement

Assessment of the vendor's risk abatement and mitigation plans

Long-term financial viability of the vendor and its sub-contractors

Experience in DDL Imaging Projects

Experience in integrating imaging systems between a mainframe and a local area network (LAN)

Reliance on sub-contractors

Staff size for vendor and sub-contractors

Strength of Proposed Key Resources

Assessment of the probability that the vendor will successfully complete the project in the required time frame

• **Quality of Proposed Approach**

This category will include rated evaluation criteria relating to a combination of factors included in the vendor's Technical proposal and Cover letter. These factors include, but are not limited to:

Quality of proposed scope of work relative to the project scope as defined in the RFP

Quality of proposed deliverables relative to the deliverables described in the RFP

Timing of proposed deliverables

Quality and completeness of the vendor's proposed project approach

Assessment of the vendor's proposed project management methodology

Assessment of the vendor's proposed project plan

Assessment of the vendor's proposed testing plan

Assessment of the vendor's proposed service/maintenance plan

Assessment of the vendor's proposed inventory management plan

Assessment of the vendor's proposed installation plan

Flexibility of proposed project approach

Fit of the vendor's proposed project approach to the State's needs

Assessment of the vendor's understanding of the STARS Technical Interface requirements

Quality of interfaces between the project management approach and methodology

Methods for handling scope expansion and overruns

Project milestone identification and project status reporting mechanisms

Flexibility and comprehensiveness of proposed tools to fit various languages, databases, operating systems and platforms in the State

Vendor's expertise with the proposed hardware and software tools/products

- **Adherence to Required Specifications**

This category will include rated evaluation criteria relating to a combination of factors included in the vendor's Technical proposal and Cover letter. These factors include, but are not limited to:

Correlation between proposed scope of work and the project scope as defined in the RFP

Correlation between proposed deliverables and the deliverables described in the RFP

Assessment of the individual specification responses that explain/describe the vendor's solution and commitment to meeting the specification

Assessment of the vendor's flexibility and willingness to meet the intent of the specification.

Flexibility and comprehensiveness of proposed tools to fit various languages, databases, operating systems and platforms in the State